

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is being requested. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are now in this application. Claims 1 and 4 has been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claims 4-5 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Claim 4 has been amended into proper form.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Persson et al (6052589). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of now canceled claim 3. Amended claim 1 requires two core networks each having a different functionality, and dual mode terminals to have either a first or second mode of operation corresponding to either the first or second core network functionality. By contrast, the terminals disclosed in Persson are dual mode only in relation to which radio interface is used to reach the core network. See column 10, lines 25-41. Specifically, Persson states "[t]he dual-mode-unit enables a mobile telephone to choose a first radio interface that is used within the access network ACC and a second radio interface that is used within the home network GSM." Persson further states "[t]he interface that is chose will depend on in which of the two networks, ACC and GSM the mobile is located." The dual-mode unit is part of a mobile-telephone. The teaching is confirmed in Fig. 4 of Persson, which shows a mobile telephone GU connectable via a generic radio access network ACC but only connectable on to a GSM core network. This teaching is also consistent with Fig. 9 of Persson, which teaches two generic radio access networks ACC1, ACC2 each cross connected to two core networks GSM1, GSM2 of the same functionality, GSM. See column 17, lines 31-45.

It follows that the key idea of amended claim 1 of a terminal being connectable to the appropriate core network of differing functionality (e.g., 2G, 3G) via either of the radio access networks (E.g., BSS, UTRAN) dependent on the mode of operation of the terminal is not taught or disclosed by Persson.

Accordingly, it is felt that claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC §102(e) over Persson.

Claims 2-3 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 1 and, thus, are also felt to be patentable under 35 USC §102(e) over Persson.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application and passage to issue of the subject application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at 973, 386-6377.

Respectfully submitted,

Mauro Costa
Sudeep Kumar Palat
Michael Roberts
Sutha Sivagnanasundaram

By 
Jimmy Goo
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 36528

Date: 10/29/04

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Room 3J-219
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733-3030